

Per Patent application:10/008,550

About the patent review

The LAN and Fischer patent are superficially similar but intrinsically different. LAN indeed extracts text layers from a layered graphics file and stores them in a database. That is the very superficial level at which both patents are similar. Everything else is different:

- LAN also stores the graphics layers in the database, Fischer does not.
- LAN limits itself to 4 text layers per image, Fischer does not
- LAN allows the "user" to modify the graphical components of the image, Fischer does not (to protect the intellectual property of the owner (see summary of the invention))
- LAN does NOT store the modified text, Fischer does.
- LAN does not provide for translation-oriented storage and processes, Fischer does.

Regarding Claim 1:

LAN claims focus on the production of posters. Their claim only deals with files that have a title, a subtitle, and a text object. The text can be modified by a translator BUT the new text is never stored and (therefore) there is no particular data structure to store the different sets of language-specific text. So, our claim of producing these data structures and storing the text in specific fashion is not obvious by looking at LAN because LAN does not even store the new text, let alone in any way that would enable translation work. We extract text, LAN limits its claim to 4 text layer, we do not, LAN does not store the changed text, we do, LAN does not create any data structures to support translation, we do. Unlike what is said in the patent review, LAN does not use the word "Translator" in Fig2;P. 2, nor in paragraph 0022, nor in lines 2-12; paragraph 0025 lines 1-3; nor in paragraph 0028, nor anywhere else in the patent. Because of this absence of translation oriented processes and data structures, and because the absence of storage of the "new" text, one cannot say that "*the motivation is obvious*". Actually it is so "non-obvious" that we were the first ones to do anything like this in the translation industry and have had the leader in the translation software industry, TRADOS, partner with us.

Regarding Claim2, Regarding Claim 3:

LAN never cites translation of any text. They substitute text for other text in a very general way. In that same general way a word processor could be seen as doing the same thing as LAN, i.e. taking an empty text and replacing with text. In [0028] the final result, i.e. a JPEG graphics file is stored, not text. If one looks at figure 1 of LAN, one sees that there is no arrow going from the JAVA interface to the database, that means that the User of the JAVA interface interacts with the Corel Object to produce a jpeg that is sent to the printing system(14) but that it never stores any new text in the database.

Regarding Claim 4:

LAN mentions extracting the original text from COREL and storing it in a database. They do not provide any storing for the "new" text, and even if they did they do not provide it in a way that support subsequent translation work, and the relationships

Per Patent application:10/008,550

between original text and its translation. Once again, storing text in a database is so general it can be used in any computer related claim.

Regarding Claim 6:

In claim 6 we do not even mention extracting text or storing text in a database. We just say our invention will help in localizing graphics files with text. Therefore we do not understand how this can be compared to [0022] where LAN describes how they extract the text from graphics and store it in a database

Regarding Claim 8:

Lan indeed extracts text layers from a layered graphics file and stores them in a database. That is the very superficial level at which both patents are similar. Everything else is different:

- LAN also stores the graphics layers in the database, Fisher does not.
- LAN limits itself to 4 text layers per image, Fischer does not
- LAN allows the "user" to modify the graphical components of the image, Fischer does not (to protect the intellectual property of the owner)
- LAN does NOT store the modified text, Fischer does.

Viewing a layered Document on page 241 of the Photoshop manual cited by the reviewer. The Photoshop text layer mechanism is very general. They can make anything visible or invisible. We do not just make text layers visible or invisible. We build special dedicated data structures and processes by which all text layers for a specific language are grouped in a distinct set, and by which this set of language specific text layers can be made visible or invisible. Moreover these language specific set are machine-generated. This capability is very important to be able to effectively store and retrieve language specific graphics. This is not obvious, and in fact nobody ever did it before us.

Per Patent application:10/008,550

Summary of their invention:

Their invention duplicates **all** the objects (text and graphics) of an object oriented graphic into their database, then makes this database available over a network. A user can modify the graphic through their user interface without having an object oriented graphics package on their computer. Their invention is limited to predefined set of fields that are usually included in a poster: Title, subtitle, body, and picture.

Per Patent application:10/008,550

My comments:

- The user interface has a Java applet which in effect is a program that the user has to download to run their Program. Running a Java applet requires having Java installed and enabled on one's computer. In effect; it is no different than downloading and installing Corel Draw or any other program described by the inventors as a "object oriented graphics package".
- In effect, the invention does the following:
 - It duplicates the original graphics file from its original layer representation to the new layered representation
 - It stores the new layered representation in a database (which might already be the case for the existing representation)
 - It provides the user with a new *Poster design software* the user has to download and install along with installing the Java run time
 - The 2 (claimed) uniqueness of this new software are
 - The ease of interface because of its extreme limitation to the 4 layers common to poster design. (available at the e URL cited below)
 - The absence of requirement to have a object oriented graphics editing tool. We have shown that the Java applet the user has to download is just that.
- LAN allows the user to change the JPEG and icons [0026], [0027]. That means that it is fundamentally different from our patent which has an explicit claim of protecting the graphics source file which in the present IP-based economy is an important asset of the company requesting the translation be done. This is also in contradiction with LAN's claim that their system is not an "object oriented application" such as Corel.
- In effect the only differences between CorelDraw and this new app are
 - Different representations of layers (we assume this)
 - Very restricted subset of the Corel capabilities (only 4 very constrained layers)
 - Access of the storage (database for Lan,, file for Corel) is only remote over the network for Lan, is either local or remote (one can place files on a network and access them with Corel) for Corel.
- Their application is common knowledge, it can be found at www.iprint.com